



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,116	02/28/2002	Eric T. Bovell	3336.1003-000	3609

21005 7590 04/07/2003

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

BUI, HUNG S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2841	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/090,116	BOVELL, ERIC T.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hung S Bui	2841

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2,3 and 6-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 2-3 and 6-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 6-8, 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reznikov et al. [US 6,378,965B1] in view of Varghese et al. [US 5,896,273].

Regarding claims 7, 10, 12-13, Reznikov et al. disclose a panel/handle (66) for circuit sled module (24, figure 2) comprising:

- a panel/handle having a front, top and a bottom (figure 5), the panel being rotatably connected via by means of a hinge pin (67) to the circuit sled module (figure 5);

- at least one hook (86, 87) near the bottom of the panel engaging the catch of a tray (28, figure 6c) when the panel is rotated into a closed position; and

- at least one side wall having at least one hook extending a portion of the side wall near the bottom of the panel (figure 5, column 1, lines 48-55).

Reznikov et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for grounding tabs electrically connecting the panel to an adjacent panel.

Varghese et al. disclose a module (figure 2) mounted in a chassis including at least one grounding tab (102, figures 2 and 3a-3b).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to include grounding tabs on a panel of Reznikov et al., as suggested by Varghese et al., for the purpose of providing grounding between adjacent modules.

Regarding claims 2 and 11, Reznikov et al. disclose a releasable fastener (77) locking the panel to the sled module (figure 6c).

Regarding claim 6, Reznikov et al. disclose the panel serving as a lever for assisting extraction of the circuit sled module from the tray.

Regarding claim 8, Reznikov et al. disclose the circuit sled module being a hard disk drive (abstract).

Regarding claims 14-15, the claim method steps would have been inherent in the product structure.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reznikov et al. in view of Varghese et al., as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Gonzales [US 4,334,261].

Regarding claim 3, Reznikov et al. in view of Varghese et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the fastener being a screw.

Gonzales discloses a module (24) being inserted within a chassis and secured by a screw (figure 2).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the screw design of Gonzales in Reznikov et al. in view of Varghese et al., for the purpose of rigidly securing the sled module in the chassis.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reznikov et al. in view of Varghese et al., as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Kim et al. [US 6,288,902 B1].

Regarding claim 9, Reznikov et al. in view of Varghese et al., disclose the instant claimed invention except for the front panel having vents therein.

Kim et al. disclose a sled module (114) having a panel/handle (220) including a plurality of vents (218, figure 6b).

It would have been an obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have vents in the handle of Reznikov et al. in view of Varghese, as suggested by Kim et al., for the purpose of providing cooling.

Response to Arguments

5. applicant's arguments filed 2/28/03 have been fully considered by they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that it would not have an obvious to use the grounding clips of Varghese with the front panel design of Reznikov.

Examiner disagrees: Varghese discloses a mounting clip on a front face of a module to provide intermodular grounding (column 5, lines 50-60). A skilled artisan

desiring to provide grounding between the sleds of Reznikov would have been motivated to apply the grounding clip design of Varghese to the front panels thereof.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung S Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-8024. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David S. Martin can be reached on (703) 308-3121. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Application/Control Number: 10/090,116

Page 6

Art Unit: 2841

308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0956.

HB
4/3/03



DAVID MARTIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800